

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 17, 21, 25, 27, and 30-40 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13, 15-19, and 21-40 are currently pending in the application.

The various issues within the Office Action mailed August 13, 2007 will now be addressed in order of appearance therein.

Regarding Section 6 (page 2), Claims 15 and 21 were amended.

Regarding Section 7 (pages 2-3), Claims 31-40 were amended to remove various notations. Applicant regrets the error. However, it is to be noted that support in the specification for these claims is not limited solely to the paragraphs set forth in the now-removed notations. As stated, support for claim 31 can be found *at least* in paragraph 37, Applicant's specification. Support for claim 32 can be found *at least* in paragraph 44. Support for claims 33-34 can be found *at least* in paragraph 42. Support for claim 35 can be found *at least* in paragraph 43. Support for claims 36-40 can be found *at least* in paragraph 56.

Regarding Section 8 (page 3), Claim 35 was amended.

Regarding Sections 9-11 (page 3), the Specification was amended.

Regarding Sections 12-14 (page 4), various of the claims were amended. No new matter has been added.

Regarding Section 15 (page 5), it is believed that the Office Action meant to refer to Claim 34 not Claim 33. Claim 34 was amended.

Regarding Section 16 (page 5), this assertion is respectfully traversed. The language of Claim 35 is supported within Applicant's specification, at least at paragraph [0043] as well as potentially other locations.

Regarding Sections 17-19 (pages 5-8), Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13, 15-19, 21-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0019864 A1 to Mayer, in view of U.S. Application Number 2003/0177223 to Erickson.

Erickson's memory 120 cited by the Office Action on page 13, section 18 can not suggested the claimed component cache. Erickson's memory 120 is shown and described as corresponding only to the service processor 112 (FIG. 1), and is not described as "managing versions of a plurality of software components on a network", as claimed. The memory 120 is

not shown as being part of any network, and does not appear to have any accessibility or interaction with any software component other than the service processor 112.

Erickson's memory 120 is also described as being used for storing firmware (paragraph 0013), and then is never mentioned again. Applicant notes the remarks within the Office Action regarding Erickson's memory 120 (Section 47, page 28), but at no point within the Erickson reference is the memory 120 described as a cache or having any caching characteristics, as claimed. Further, adapting Erickson's memory 120 to fit within Mayer's environment could result in breaking Erickson's invention, or rendering it unusable for its intended purpose.

For at least the above reasons, the rejections of Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13, 15-19, 21-30, and 32, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, can now be withdrawn.

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. After entry of the amendments, further examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Accompanying this document is a Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form. Acknowledgement of this Request is respectfully requested. Additionally, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/christophermtanner#41518/

Christopher M. Tanner
Reg. No. 41,518

Date: November 13, 2007

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076